



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,461	09/30/2003	Lu-De Chen	WISP0031USA	2460
27765	7590	02/28/2006	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			RAHMAN, FAHMIDA	
P.O. BOX 506			ART UNIT	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PAPER NUMBER	
			2116	

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/605,461	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Fahmida Rahman	Art Unit 2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10 are pending.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy filed on 6/29/2004 has been received.

Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a translation of the foreign application should be submitted under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1 and 7 are objected for the following informalities:

Claim 1 recites the limitations "detecting how long a second power supply supplies power" in line 3 and "if the second power supply supplies power for less than a predetermined period" in line 8. It is not clearly established from the claim language if the comparison with predetermined period, as mentioned in line 8, is performed with the supply period of second power supply. For the rest of the office action, it is assumed that "detecting the period of a second power supply" and "if said period is less than a predetermined period" are intended.

Art Unit: 2116

Claim 7 recites the limitations "detecting how long a battery supplies power" in line 3 and "if the battery supplies power for less than a predetermined period" in lines 9-10. It is not clearly established from the description if the comparison with predetermined period, as mentioned in lines 9-10, is performed with the supply period of battery. For the rest of the office action, it is assumed that "detecting the period of a battery" and "if said period is less than a predetermined period" are intended.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshizawa et al (US Patent 5566081), in view of Yoshioka et al (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0075345).

For claim 1, Yoshizawa et al teach the following limitations:

A method of controlling the operational mode (Fig 3 shows the two modes. Thus, the method teaches the controlling of operating mode) **of a computer system** (Fig 2 shows the computer system) **comprising the following steps:**

(a) detecting how long a power supply supplies power to the computer system, when the power supply of the computer system is in a particular state (step 128 is the preamble searching time in second mode. Thus, 130 is determining the time period of how long the system is searching preamble in second mode. That can be considered a particular state of the power supply, since preamble searching phase takes less power as shown in Fig 1C. In addition, Fig 3 shows the preamble searching in second mode. It is following a particular pattern. The use of power in that state is described in lines 61-67 of column 1. Thus, the preamble searching phase in second mode can be considered as a special state of power supply); **and**

(b) changing the operational mode of the computer system (Fig 3 is showing the two modes. Fig 4 is showing the part where system is switched from second mode to first mode), **if the power supply supplies power in the particular state for less than a predetermined period** (130 is checking if timer is less than a predetermined time period. Since, timer represents the time of power supply supplying power in searching preamble in second mode as discussed above, the timer checks if the period of power supplied in that particular state is less than a predetermined period. In addition, lines 21-24 of column 5 mention that battery returns to first mode if less than predetermined time

Art Unit: 2116

period. Thus, mode is changed when power supply in preamble searching state supplies power for less than a predetermined time), **otherwise remaining in the current operational mode of the computer system** (if 130 is affirmative, operating mode stays in second mode).

Yoshizawa et al do not teach the two power supplies, the changing from first supply to second supply and detecting how long the system is in second power supply. The system of Yoshizawa et al does not use second power supply for preamble searching state of 128.

The system of Yoshioka et al teaches a second power supply or auxiliary supply that replaces first supply or main supply ([0099] of page 8 mentions that 105 may be replaced with 118) and the period of supply for second power supply (lines 12-14 of [0024] of page 2 mention that the length of time during which the auxiliary battery is used as a power supply is measured).

It would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshioka et al and Yoshizawa et al. The use of second auxiliary power supply, as taught in Yoshioka et al, for step 128 of Yoshizawa et al, renders the whole invention of the pending claim obvious to an ordinary skill in the art. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a second power supply in preamble searching step 128 in Yoshizawa et al, since that would help saving

Art Unit: 2116

the power of the system. The preamble searching time 130 is not consuming much power. Thus, the main power supply can be turned off and an auxiliary unit can be turned on to provide power for state 128. That way, 130 would be measuring the period of auxiliary power supply supplying power and changing mode of the system depending on that period.

For claim 3, the auxiliary unit of Yoshioka et al is a battery.

For claim 5, Yoshioka et al and Yoshizawa et al. do not mention that the computer is a note book computer.

Examiner takes an official notice that the use of notebook computer is well known in the art.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Yoshioka et al, as modified by Yoshizawa et al. in a notebook computer, since that would reduce the power management of the notebook computer.

For claim 6, the system of Yoshizawa et al is a computer system, since 42 is a CPU.

5. Claims 2, 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshizawa et al (US Patent 5566081), in view of Yoshioka et al (US Patent

Art Unit: 2116

Application Publication 2004/0075345), further in view of applicant's admission of prior art.

For claim 2, combination of Yoshizawa et al and Yoshioka et al teaches all of the limitations of claim 1. However, neither Yoshizawa et al nor Yoshioka et al teaches the AC/DC adapter.

Applicant mentions in lines 1-3 of [0004] that a computer system generally comprise an AC/DC adapter.

It would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshioka et al, Yoshizawa et al. and the applicant's admission of prior art. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the AC/DC adapter for providing power to the component, since this is widely used and convenient to use.

For claim 7, combination of Yoshizawa et al and Yoshioka et al teaches all of the limitations as stated in claim 1 but the first supply is an AC/DC adapter connected to alternating current source.

Applicant mentions in lines 1-3 of [0004] that a computer system generally comprise an AC/DC adapter.

Art Unit: 2116

It would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshioka et al, Yoshizawa et al. and the applicant's admission of prior art. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the AC/DC adapter for providing power to the component, since this is widely used and convenient to use, especially in computer system.

For claim 9, Yoshioka et al and Yoshizawa et al. do not mention that the computer is a notebook computer.

Examiner takes an official notice that the use of notebook computer is well known in the art.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Yoshioka et al, as modified by Yoshizawa et al. in a notebook computer, since that would help the power management of the notebook computer.

For claim 10, the system of Yoshizawa et al is a computer system, since 42 is a CPU.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshizawa et al (US Patent 5566081), in view of Yoshioka et al (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0075345), further in view of Kling et al (US patent 6367023).

Art Unit: 2116

For claim 8, the combination of Yoshizawa et al, Yoshioka et al does not explicitly mention reducing frequency to save power.

Kling et al teaches a system where frequency is reduced to save power (410 and 510)

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshizawa et al, Yoshioka et al, and Kling et al. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to reduce the frequency, since reducing frequency reduces the power consumption.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshizawa et al (US Patent 5566081), in view of Yoshioka et al (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0075345), further in view of applicant's admission of prior art, further in view of Kling et al (US patent 6367023).

For claim 8, the combination of Yoshizawa et al, Yoshioka et al, applicant's admission of prior art does not explicitly mention reducing frequency to save power.

Kling et al teaches a system where frequency is reduced to save power (410 and 510)

Art Unit: 2116

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yoshizawa et al, Yoshioka et al, applicant's admission of prior art and Kling et al. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to reduce the frequency, since reducing frequency reduces the power consumption.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fahmida Rahman whose telephone number is 571-272-8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on 571-272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/605,461
Art Unit: 2116

Page 11

Fahmida Rahman
Examiner
Art Unit 2116



LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100